

Date: Thu, 18 Mar 93 04:30:19 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #67
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 18 Mar 93 Volume 93 : Issue 67

Today's Topics:

 public apology (2 msgs)
 Reduction of the code requirements (3 msgs)
 remote monitoring...Like my phone ringing

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 17 Mar 93 13:01:28 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: public apology
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

BONG BONG BONG *****==ENGLISH LANGUAGE USAGE ALERT==***** BONG BONG BONG

Steve KA0VYB writes:
> their services. Irregardless of whether you are in the right or the
    ~~~~~

Sorry. No such word. Please restart.  
  
-----

Date: Wed, 17 Mar 1993 20:39:30 GMT  
From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!rouge!  
cfm1471@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: public apology  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <01GVWOL2KKNM9LV07M@IRIS.UNCG.EDU> MOSIER@iris.uncg.EDU (Steve Mosier) writes:

>BONG BONG BONG \*\*\*\*\*==ENGLISH LANGUAGE USAGE ALERT==\*\*\*\*\* BONG BONG BONG

>

>Steve KA0VYB writes:

>> their services. Irregardless of whether you are in the right or the

>

~~~~~

>

>Sorry. No such word. Please restart.

>

Get a life Steve, this AINT rec.radio.english.grammar. If you dont understand the meaning of the ^^^^ message, just ask.

```
=====
| Charles Morrison      | cfm1471@ucs.usl.edu   | These are my views,   |
| KI5XP                 | ki5xp@ucs.usl.edu     | NOT anyone elses!     |
| U. of SouthWestern    | ki5xp@ki5xp.aara.org  | But who cares?        |
|      La.              | KI5XP @ K5ARH.LA      |                        |
| Lafayette, La 70506   |                        |                        |
=====
```

Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy

Subject: Re: public apology

Summary:

Expires:

References: <01GVWOL2KKNM9LV07M@IRIS.UNCG.EDU>

Sender:

Followup-To:

Distribution:

Organization: Univ. of Southwestern La., Lafayette

Keywords:

Date: 17 Mar 1993 15:51:44 GMT

From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Reduction of the code requirements

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> Thanks for the info. I am interested in talking with my uncle who
> flies European routes for Delta. Would this be legal for an
> private person to comunicate with an airplane pilot?
> (on HF bands)

No. The FCC will not license a private station to operate on those frequencies. It is required that both the operator and the station be licensed.

-Ron

Date: Wed, 17 Mar 1993 21:59:48 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!sleepy.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!shalamsk@ames.arp
Subject: Reduction of the code requirements
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1o7hegINNfrb@topaz.bds.com> ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:

>> Thanks for the info. I am interested in talking with my uncle who
>> flies European routes for Delta. Would this be legal for an
>> private person to communicate with an airplane pilot?
>> (on HF bands)

>

>No. The FCC will not license a private station to operate on those
>frequencies. It is required that both the operator and the station be
>licensed.

>

>-Ron

Actually, all that is necessary is for the pilot to be a ham. The person on the ground only needs to find a willing Amateur operator to make the contact using "third-party" rules. You could even use a phone patch or a remote base to reach the ground terminal.

I have had several interesting conversations with military and civilian flights in this hemisphere of the world. All I had was a dipole or vertical antenna and 100 watts. When I was a newly-licensed Novice in 1979 I even had a CW contact with an aeronautical mobile! Took a while for me to understand what /AM meant! (Where in the world is AM? :-)

John KJ9U/KH6

--

INTERNET: shalamsk@uhunix.uhcc.hawaii.edu, kj9u@uhm.ampr.org
I speak for no one other than myself, of course.

Date: Thu, 18 Mar 1993 10:46:05 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!news.ysu.edu!yfn.ysu.edu!

ae674@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Reduction of the code requirements

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> Actually, all that is necessary is for the pilot to be a ham. The person on
> the ground only needs to find a willing Amateur operator to make the
> contact using "third-party" rules.

My uncle is unfortunately not a ham. The radio he uses is a all band transceiver. Why does the fcc require seperate transceivers? There could conceivably be a member of his crew with a amateur license so he could operate 3rd party. Does anybody talk to airplane pilot hams? Most transatlantic pilots have a lot of time on there hands. The plane he flies is one of those newer airbus planes. They are so computerized that they pretty much fly them selves. I guess this is just another dumb fcc regulation.

Date: Wed, 17 Mar 1993 17:27:25 GMT

From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!

usenet.coe.montana.edu!news.u.washington.edu!saturn.wwc.edu!saturn.wwc.edu!

morgdw@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: remote monitoring...Like my phone ringing

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I have heard two theories on reverse phone patches:

1. The licensed person is the control operator from a distance and anyone can use the equipment so long as you are controlling it.
2. I want to remotely monitor a device (my phone) and if I get a signal then I will originate a patch to my home line as control operator.

My question is, do either of these theories hold water, why or why not?

I have talked to the arrl and they say their personal opinion is that it should be legal but currently the fcc thinks that a nonham is a cognate force causing the signal therefore they are using the radio illegally.

My objective is to get my phone calls anywhere, conversation non business, how can I legally do it?

Is it legal for an answering machine to signal me if I get any messages?

Dwight

Morgdw@wwc.edu

Date: 18 Mar 1993 02:32:21 GMT
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C40qz3.Hzv@news.ysu.edu>, <1o7hegINNfrb@topaz.bds.com>,
<C41zro.H62@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject : Re: Reduction of the code requirements

>> Thanks for the info. I am interested in talking with my uncle who
>> flies European routes for Delta.

> Actually, all that is necessary is for the pilot to be a ham. The person on
> the ground only needs to find a willing Amateur operator to make the
> contact using "third-party" rules.

Technically, unless the pilot carries an additional amateur rig, separate
from the aviation rig (never mind that they are capable of operating on
the same frequencies) it will still be illegal. It's extremely unlikely
that DELTA would allow the use of an amateur transciever on *ANY* flight
let alone a transatlantic one where navigation is much more critical.

-Ron

Date: Thu, 18 Mar 1993 06:38:43 GMT
From: qualcom.qualcomm.com!servo.qualcomm.com!karn@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1o7hegINNfrb@topaz.bds.com>, <C41zro.H62@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<1o8mvlINNgbi@topaz.bds.com>
Subject : Re: Reduction of the code requirements

In article <1o8mvlINNgbi@topaz.bds.com> ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:
>the same frequencies) it will still be illegal. It's extremely unlikely
>that DELTA would allow the use of an amateur transciever on *ANY* flight
>let alone a transatlantic one where navigation is much more critical.

Actually, given current practice, transoceanic aeronautical navigation
is much *less* critical (in the sense of being susceptible to
interference) than domestic US navigation. Most transoceanic airliners
use inertial navigation (INS) which is inherently quite resistant to
RFI. Because of the high cost of INS (and the relatively poor accuracy,
~1 mile/hr) it is not generally used on overland flights, where VOR
is the standard.

That's one thing that really annoys me about the airlines. All sorts of newer navigation systems are becoming available, and not only are they generally more accurate and reliable than VOR, but they're inherently much more immune to interference from consumer electronic devices. (I'm thinking mainly about LORAN-C and GPS -- once GPS becomes operational both should be installed as backups for each other). But no - the airlines would prefer to ban all electronics (not just receivers).

Phil

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #67
